

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
WESTERN DIVISION
No. 5:18-CV-343-D

SHOMARI E. NORMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

EVONNE S. HOPKINS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

On May 20, 2019, Magistrate Judge Numbers issued a Memorandum and Recommendation (“M&R”) [D.E. 58], denied Norman’s motions to deny discovery and to show cause [D.E. 41, 51], recommended that the court grant Evonne S. Hopkins’s motions to dismiss [D.E. 32, 45], and dismiss the action against defendant Anthony and defendant North Carolina Child Support Agency. On May 21, 2019, Norman filed a motion of discovery and addendum 2 [D.E. 59]. Defendants did not respond. Plaintiff did not file objections to the M&R.

“The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge’s report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (emphasis, alteration, and quotation omitted); see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Absent a timely objection, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted).

The court has reviewed the M&R and the record. The court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record, and the court adopts the conclusions in the M&R.

In sum, the court GRANTS Hopkins's motions to dismiss [D.E. 32, 45], DISMISSES the action against defendant Anthony, and DISMISSES the action against North Carolina Child Support Agency. The court DENIES as moot plaintiff's motion of discovery and addendum 2 [D.E. 59]. The clerk shall close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 16 day of August 2019.



JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge